

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8 and 12 remain pending in the present application. Claims 7 and 9-11 have been cancelled. Claims 1-6 and 8 have been amended. Claim 12 is new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1 and 8 are objected to because of informalities. The claims have been amended to overcome the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Murakami (GB 2203677). Claims 1-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Yoder or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Yoder in view of Murakami. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 1 has been amended to define the cutting groove as extending entirely across the width of the strip material. In addition, the limitations of Claim 7 have been added to Claim 1.

Murakami (GB 2203677) does not disclose a strip material having thin parts and thick parts formed over the entire width of the strip material.

Further, one of a pair of rollers is arranged at the same position in a movement direction of a strip material as that of the other of the pair of rollers in all of Yoder (U.S. Pat. No. 2,098,989), Murakami (GB 2203677), and Nordquist (U.S. Pat. No. 2,444,463).

On the other hand, in the present invention, one of a pair of rollers is arranged to be offset in the movement direction of the strip material from one other of a pair of rollers.

Furthermore, in Nordquist, in order to cut a tube, it is necessary to provide an upwardly inclined section 73 and an elevated horizontal section 74 in a conveying direction of a tube, while, in the present invention, it is unnecessary to provide the upwardly inclined section in the conveying direction of the tube.

Thus, Applicant believes Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2-6 and 8 which ultimately depend on Claim 1 is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoder in view of Nordquist (U.S. Pat. No. 2,444,463). Claim 7 is alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoder in view of Murakami as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nordquist. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami in view of Nordquist (U.S. Pat. No. 2,444,463). Claim 7 has been cancelled and its limitations have been added to Claim 1 along with additional amendments as described above. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM

New Claim 12 is an independent claim which is similar to amended Claim 1 but without the limitations of Claim 7 added. Applicant believes new Claim 12 reads on the elected invention.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 28, 2006

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/hmr